REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-6 have been amended. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawing under 35 C.F.R. § 1.83(a); rejected claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; rejected claims 1 and 5-6 under U.S.C. § 101; rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,365,589 to Gutowitz[1]; and rejected claims 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gutowitz in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,792,111 to Italia et al. ("Italia"). Claims 1-6 are pending. Of these, claims 1-3 are independent.

A.   Objection to the Drawing - 35 C.F.R. § 1.83(a)

This amendment replaces Fig. 1 in order to include every feature of the invention specified in the claims. No new matter has been entered. Support for the replacement figure may be found in the specification on page 10, line 10, through page 11, line 16; page 13, lines 14-24; and page 14, lines 30-34. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawing under 35 C.F.R. § 1.83(a).

B.   Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly recite active, positive steps, and claims 5-6 have been amended to claim a system instead of a

---

[1] The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

method. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

C. Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 101

By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to include active, positive steps, and claims 5-6 have been amended to claim a system instead of a method. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1 and 5-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

D. Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a)

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gutowitz. Currently amended claim 1 recites, among other things: "carrying out cryptographic communication of information by combining said chaos block encryption and said chaos stream encryption." Claims 2 and 3 also recite, among other things: "said plural CPUs, after enciphering a plaintext code which is a secrecy object by chaos block encryption, encipher by chaos stream encryption and transmit an obtained cipher code." Gutowitz fails to teach or suggest at least these elements of claims 1-3.

The Office Action describes Gutowitz as disclosing these elements of claims 1-3 (see Office Action, pages 5-6, citing Gutowitz at col. 22, lines 31-47; col. 10, lines 3-11; col. 32, line 50, through col. 33, line 8; col. 33, lines 41-51; and col. 34, lines 38-52). However, the Office Action fails to explain how these passages from Gutowitz are relevant. Moreover, the iterative encryption/decryption method disclosed by Gutowitz, in Figs. 2-3 and 6, appears to be a form of block encryption (see col. 13, lines 46-59),

wherein blocks may be of variable length (see col. 4, line 63, through col. 5, line 12).

The parallel encryption/decryption method disclosed by Gutowitz, in Figs. 4-5 and 7-8,

appears to be another form of carrying out the method of iterative encryption/decryption,

which uses parallel processing (see col. 13, lines 28-44). Gutowitz also appears to

disclose a system implementing stream encryption in Fig. 10 (see col. 5, lines 13-20

and col. 32, line 50, through col. 33, line 8). Gutowitz also appears to suggest the use

of chaos encryption (see col. 10, lines 9-11). Yet, such disclosure does not constitute

"carrying out cryptographic communication of information by *combining* said chaos

block encryption and said chaos stream encryption," as claimed in claim 1, and does not

constitute "plural CPUs, after enciphering a plaintext code which is a secrecy object by

chaos block encryption, encipher by chaos stream encryption and transmit an obtained

cipher code," as claimed in claims 2-3.

Furthermore, Gutowitz discloses that the invention may be used in either a

stream-encryption mode or a block-encryption mode (see col. 34, lines 38-40). Thus,

the disclosure of Gutowitz cannot constitute "carrying out cryptographic communication

of information by *combining* said chaos block encryption and said chaos stream

encryption," as claimed in claim 1, and cannot constitute "plural CPUs, after enciphering

a plaintext code which is a secrecy object by chaos block encryption, encipher by chaos

stream encryption and transmit an obtained cipher code," as claimed in claims 2-3.

Since Gutowitz fails to teach each and every element of claims 1-3, claims 1-3 are not

anticipated by Gutowitz.

Claims 4-6 depend from and add additional features to independent claims 1-3. Moreover <u>Italia</u>, relied on for its disclosure of an initial state x(0), fails to cure the deficiency of <u>Gutowitz</u>. Accordingly, claims 4-6 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 17, 2005   By: _____

Ronald J. Ward
Reg. No. 54,870

Attachment: Fig. 1 Replacement Sheet